



**Allied Site FAQ Suggestions
(from Denise Keele and Sarah Hill)
July 15, 2015**

STATE AT THE TOP:

All remedies are protective; that means that they all meet federal requirements.
Each will be as safe as any other.

1. So why not chose total removal?
 - a. PCBs are very dangerous. Wherever they go, as a part of remediation, will require long-term monitoring and secure storage. Whether they remain at a Superfund site or are removed, they will be monitored and maintained. Total removal provides no added protection for that necessity.
2. So, again, why not remove it all?
 - a. Because there are some risks associated with ANY remediation.
 - b. Removal would incur some risks. These are balanced against the added benefit achieved by taking it all away.
 - c. Those risks include the impact of transport.
 - d. E.g., 150,000 trucks over 5 years.
3. Didn't you choose this because it's the lowest cost?
 - a. No; funding does not influence selection of remedy. The law requires that that ANY proposed remedy be protective. All these remedies meet that requirement. They do so with different mechanisms.
4. If there were more money in the trust fund would you spend on this site?
 - a. We will spend the money that is required to secure the site. It's great to have a trust fund; but other sites with no trust fund get remediated. And remediation means, secured and protective per statue (law).
5. How do you know the site is safe?
 - a. Because monitoring over the past # years has shown that the PCBs have not moved at all. We're confident that they won't in the future.
 - b. SAY MORE CONCRETELY about that.
6. So, you say the site is protective of groundwater. But how will it be protective of public uses?
 - a. Because monitoring over the past # years has shown that the PCBs have not moved at all. We're confident that they won't in the future.
 - b. SAY MORE CONCRETELY about that.
7. How will the public be involved?
 - a. We are going above and beyond the requirements for public participation. We will hold any discussion with community groups as asked.
 - b. On-going partnership with the community are part of plan for monitoring. We are never going to not monitor this site. Part of the monitoring includes regular communication with the community.
8. Who will own the site?

- a. COME UP WITH A GOOD ANSWER! If the answer is "it depends," then lay out some real scenarios.

Other recommendations:

1. Maybe you want to state, pretty plainly: that taking it all away has more local impacts and risks than consolidating and containing in place. i.e., risks are LOWER with waste-in-place and local monitoring remedies.
2. Fix a part of current FAQ which helps you not at all build trust and help combat risk perception problem. (please go back to our original set of questions. We feel you're punting on this one and look at the one about the protective will the site be once we have people on the site for recreation.
3. Do something to make this VISUALLY legible for lay folk, looking for common sense language. Can you create a table with each proposed option and the benefits and costs associated with it in LAY terms and with concrete examples (e.g., number of trucks over how many years).